

Remarks

In this response, Claims 6, 8, 9, 11-16, and 21 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 11, 12, and 21 have been amended. In view of the amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §112

Claim 21 was rejected as being indefinite under §112. Claim 21 has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103

Claims 6, 11-13, 15, 16, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,738,841 issued to Wolff. Of these, Claims 21 and 11 are independent. Claim 6 depends from Claim 21 and Claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 depend from Claim 11.

The Examiner asserts that Wolff, Fig. 9; Col. 8, line 32 through col. 9, line 30 and col. 5, lines 21-49 teach each element of Claims 6, 11-13, 15, 16, and 21. Fig. 9 simply shows a PDA (930), a server (920), and a printer (250) connected to a network. The printer (250) includes a print server (255) that is also referred to as a printer driver (255). The printer driver/server (255) can either be integrated in the printer (250) or coupled to the printer (250). In either case, as indicated in Fig. 9, the printer driver/server (255) is not connected to the printer (250) via the Wolff's network. Wolff, col. 5, lines 21-49 mentions the print driver/server (255) emulates both a server and a client and is able to send and receive HTTP requests.

Wolff, Col. 8, line 32 through col. 9, line 30 mentions that PDA (930) can receive data from server (920) used to produce business sales quotes. The server may have received the data needed to generate the quote from the PDA (930). With the PDA (230) a user can request that a contract based on a quote be printed by sending a print request to the printer driver (255). The printer driver (255) retrieves the data to be printed from the server (920), formats that data, and transmits the formatted data to the print engine of the printer (250).

Claim 21 is directed to a method for remotely printing a document and, as amended, recites the following.

1. communicatively coupling a personal digital assistant (PDA) to an intranet, the intranet providing access to document reference information corresponding to documents available for printing;
2. storing the document reference information with the PDA;
3. retrieving printer information corresponding to a network printer using the PDA, the network printer being configured to communicatively coupled with the intranet via the Internet, wherein the printer information includes a network address for the network printer; and
4. communicating, from the PDA, the printer information and the document reference information corresponding to a document to be printed to a document retrieval system located on the intranet such that, responsive thereto, information for printing the document is communicated to the network printer without further use of the PDA, the information for printing the document being communicated from the document retrieval system to the network printer via the intranet and the Internet with the document being printed at the network printer.

To summarize, Claim 21 recites a method that utilizes a document retrieval system that is located on an intranet that is remote from a network printer. That is, communications between the document retrieval system and the network printer leave the intranet and pass through the internet. To print a document, a PDA is used to select a reference for that document. The PDA retrieves printer information that includes a network address for the network printer. The PDA is then used to communicate the document reference and printer information to the document retrieval system which in turn communicates the document to the network printer.

In Wolff's system, a PDA is used to send a print request to a print driver/server (255) that is either integrated in to coupled to the printer (250). The print driver/server (255) in an unexplained fashion retrieves the document via a

network from a server (920). The print driver/server (255) formats the document and causes the printer (250) to print the document.

The Examiner is apparently equating Wolff's printer driver/server (255) with the document retrieval system recited in Claim 21. This is simply not a valid comparison. Claim 21 recites that (1) the document retrieval system is on an intranet, (2) the network printer connects to that intranet via the internet, and (3) the document being printed is communicated from the document retrieval system to the network printer via the intranet and the Internet with the document being printed at the network printer. This is simply not possible under Wolff's teachings.

For at least these reasons, Claim 21 is patentable over Wolff as are Claims 6, 8, and 9 which depend from Claim 21.

Claim 11 is directed to a print system for use with an intranet where the intranet is configured to store information corresponding to documents available for printing. As amended, Claim 11 recites the following elements.

1. a document retrieval system communicatively coupled with the intranet, said document retrieval system being configured to receive document reference information corresponding to a document to be printed and printer information corresponding to a network printer that is coupled to the intranet via the Internet and, in response thereto, provide print information corresponding to the document to be printed to the network printer via the Internet such that the network printer prints the document; and
2. a remote print request system configured to communicatively couple with said document retrieval system, said remote print request system being further configured to retrieve printer information corresponding to the network printer, the printer information including a network address for the network printer, to receive document reference information corresponding to documents available for printing via the intranet, store the document reference information remotely from the intranet, enable selection by a user of a document to be printed, and provide the printer

information and the document reference information corresponding to a document selected to be printed to said document retrieval system such that the document retrieval system communicates the information corresponding to the document to the network printer without further use of the remote print request system.

To summarize, Claim 11 recites a system capable of implementing the method of Claim 21. Claim 11 recites a document retrieval system that is on an intranet remote from a network printer. That is, the printer is connected to the intranet via the Internet. To print a document, the document retrieval system is configured to receive printer information for the network printer and document reference information for the document to be printed. The document retrieval system is configured to communicate information corresponding to the document to be printed to the network printer via the intranet and the Internet.

To reiterate, the Examiner is apparently equating Wolff's printer driver/server (255) with the document retrieval system recited in Claim 21. As with Claim 21, this is simply not a valid comparison as Wolff's printer driver/server (255) does not communicate with Wolff's printer (250) via an intranet and the Internet. For at least the same reasons, Claim 21 is patentable over Wolff as are Claim 11 and Claims 12-16 which depend from Claim 11.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103


Claims 8, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,738,841 issued to Wolff in view of US Pub. 2002/0065515 to Jaynes. Claims 8 and 9 depend from Claim 21 and Claim 14 depends from Claim 11. For at least the same reasons Claims 21 and 11 are patentable so are Claims 8, 9, and 14.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 6, 8, 9, 11-16, and 21 define allowable subject matter. The Examiner is requested to indicate the allowability of all pending claims in the application and to pass the application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Darrel D. Cherry

By


Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

March 2, 2006